

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 14, 24 and 25 have been amended and these amendments are fully supported on page 10, paragraph [0040] of the specification. Claims 1-27 stand rejected.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 13-14, 17-22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O’Leary (US 5,950,000). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 13, 24 and 25, the claims recite a “a build rule object comprising at least one transformation rule associated with the build tool” and “transforming a generalized command line comprising the name of the tool and at least one tag through the use of the at least one transformation rule into an executable command line” in claim 13, “transforming the generalized command line using the at least one transformation rule comprising the name of the tool and at least one tag into an executable command line” in claim 24, and “the at least one transformation rule for transforming the generalized command line into an executable command line for executing the tool” in claim 25. In order to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. The Office Action appears to assert that the O’Leary reference teaches these features in Col 6, lines 3-25 and 46-65 of the reference, however, it does not.

The O’Leary reference teaches the building of a makefile in Col 6, lines 38-45. However, the makefile as disclosed in the O’Leary reference has as a command line parameter a single parameter – the name of the selected file. The makefile build entry in O’Leary is disclosed as “app in /home/pat/src/Makefile.” The Office Action seems to assert on page 14 that “Makefile” is the name of the tool and that “‘home’, ‘pat’, ‘src’ are analogous to the properties associated with the tool.” The Office Action, in this remark, is completely mis-characterizing the reference. Although “app” is the name of the file to be retrieved, the descriptor for the logical location of “app” within the file system is the entirety of “/home/pat/src/Makefile.” In no way is the location of a file analogous to properties associated with a Tool; this is simply the file system descriptor that is used to locate the

“app” file to be executed. Therefore, O’Leary does not provide a disclosure of the name of the tool to be executed and “a build rule object comprising at least one transformation rule associated with the build tool a build rule object comprising at least one transformation rule associated with the build tool” as recited in claims 13, 24 and 25.

In addition, as disclosed in O’Leary the makefile is a static construct that may not change, may not incorporate new or different elements, after the makefile has been defined. In contrast, the instant invention recites a “transformation” utilizing at least one transformation rule that describes how this transformation is to be used to create a customized build rule. This is important because the transformation rule, in use with the at least one property attached to the custom build rule, provides the ability for a single custom build rule to provide a custom makefile for each application that calls the custom build rule. The O’Leary reference discloses a straightforward makefile process with the name of the selected file and no switches or other parameters on the command line. This is not the same as the features recited in claims 13, 24 and 25 above. Therefore, the O’Leary reference does not anticipate the claim elements of claims 13, 24 and 25 as recited. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 27, the claim recites “the custom build rule object transforms a generalized command line by programmatically replacing a tag with a property value to generate the executable command line” and “transforming the generalized command line into the executable command line by programmatically replacing a tag in the generalized command line with the value of the switch property.” Claim 27 depends from claim 25 and thus inherits the claim features of claim 25 as well. The office action seems to assert that the features of these claims are disclosed in Col 6, lines 46-65, however, they are not. Once again, the O’Leary reference in this section discloses a makefile with a single command line element, the file name, and that the file name is located within the file system at “/home/pat/src/Makefile”. Claim 27 recites “the build rule comprising at least one transformation rule and a generalized command line comprising the name of the tool and at least one property associated with the tool and the at least one transformation rule for transforming the generalized command line into an executable command line for executing the tool” as inherited from claim 25 and goes on to recite “transforming the generalized command line into the executable command line by programmatically replacing a tag in the

generalized command line with the value of the switch property.” O’Leary does not teach or disclose these features of claim 27. Therefore, the O’Leary reference does not anticipate the claim elements of claim 27 as recited. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 14, 17-22, and 26-27, these claims each depend from one of independent claims 13, 24, or 25. In view of the above, it is clear that O’Leary fails to establish anticipation of these claims. The defendant claims are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons shown for claims 13, 24, and 25. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O’Leary (US Patent 5,950,000) in view of Mason (US Patent 6,817,005), and claims 3-6, 15-16, and 23 are rejected in further view of Odaka (US Patent Publication 2003/0140333). The O’Leary reference relates to a GUI interface for programmers to use in building static makefiles for integrating software tools. The Mason reference relates to a modular design method and system for programmable logic devices. The Odaka published application relates to a conditional compile environment for use in web servers and web browsers.

Regarding claim 1, this claim recites at least “a processor with a dynamic property descriptor associated with a custom build rule object, the custom build rule object comprising at least one transformation rule and command line syntax for at least one custom build rule” and “the tool generating an executable command line using the at least one transformation rule comprising the name of the tool to be executed and one or more properties associated with the tool.” The O’Leary and Mason references, singly or in combination, are silent with regard to a custom build rule object “comprising at least one transformation rule” and “the tool generating an executable command line using the at least one transformation rule.” The O’Leary reference does not provide any disclosure for a custom makefile that is created through the use of any sort of rule, as the makefile is pre-configured and simply called by a user to begin processing. The Mason reference also provides no disclosure for a makefile

that is built through the use of a transformation rule. Again, the transformation rule provides the ability for a single custom build rule object to be used by multiple applications to create customized makefiles for each application through the use of a transformation rule that is specific to each application. The transformation rule for each application is contained within the custom build rule and applied upon execution of the custom build rule object. Therefore, the combination of the O'Leary and Mason references does not provide the disclosure necessary to render claim 1 obvious. Further, the Odaka reference does not remedy the lack of disclosure in the combined O'Leary and Mason references as the Odaka reference is silent with regard to transformation rules for a build object of any type. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 2-12, 15-16 and 23 each of these claims depends from one of claims 1, 13 or 24. In view of the above, it is clear that O'Leary fails to establish anticipation of these claims, and that the combination of O'Leary, Mason and Odaka fails to provide the teaching to render these claims obvious. The defendant claims are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons shown for claims 1, 13, and 24. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2929/303466.01
Application No.: 10/772,902
Office Action Dated: 05/19/2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

Date: August 19, 2008

/Steven B. Samuels/
Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439